

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 remain pending in this application. No amendments have been made to the claims. For the reasons set forth below, all of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action dated February 3, 2010,

- Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs (US 5,968,073) in view of Burgert et al. (US 4,984,579, “Burgert”) and further in view of Matusi (US 6,551,237);
- Claims 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs, Burgert and Matusi and further in view of Englehardt et al. (US 4,831,242, “Englehardt”); and
- Claims 13-15 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs, Burgert and Matusi and further in view of Imai (US 7,603,282).

These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

As explained in a prior response, embodiments of the present invention provide:

- a first input means that is outside the main body, which main body has the second input means;
- data input from the first input means is a *critical* compression value (pressure or duration); and
- the second input means on the main body sets the *maximum* value of the compression values (pressure or duration) that are used in practicing the claimed pressure muscle training method to the extent equal to or lower than the critical compression value (pressure or duration).

These three features contribute to advantageous effects of the present invention in that the user can set a maximum value of the compression pressure or duration depending on his/her

physical condition with a high degree of safety since the maximum settings are limited by the critical compression pressure or duration settings set by a trainer or other expert.

Claim 1, for example, expressly recites "the maximum value of said compression pressure recorded on said second recording means being controlled not to exceed said preset critical compression pressure." Again, the second recording means, which receives its input via the second input means, e.g., via a user manipulating the second input means, is controlled not to exceed a critical value that is set by the first recording means, which is adapted to freely be attached to and removed from the main body of the compression pressure controller.

Jacobs describes methods and apparatus for applying pressure to a portion of a body and explains that the applied pressure "fluctuates between predetermined maximum and minimum levels..." See, e.g. the abstract of Jacobs.

Jacobs further discloses, as noted on page 2 of the Office Action, first input means (27), second input means (25) and buttons (26) on a housing 16. However, the only disclosure regarding the functionality of these various controls is in the first paragraph of the "Detailed Description of a Preferred Embodiment" section of the Jacobs patent. This introductory paragraph merely identifies these control features, and generally explains that these controls are used to "input parameters and data" (e.g., maximum, minimum and duration of each time cycle).

However, Jacobs does not disclose the precise requirements of the claims. That is, there is nothing in Jacobs that discloses or even suggests that a separable first input means is used to record one type of data to a first recording means, and then that data (i.e., a *critical* pressure or duration) is used to limit the application of another data value (i.e., a *maximum* pressure or duration) input via a second input means and recorded on a second recording means. In fact, Jacobs is totally silent regarding any interaction among data entered via remote control units (25), (27) and buttons 16. Although reference is made in the Office Action to column 6, lines 14-24 of Jacobs, that passage of the cited reference merely discusses how the pressure applied fluctuates between a maximum and a minimum value over a given time period. Again, however, there is no disclosure in Jacobs regarding interaction between or control over one input parameter based on the input of another input parameter, which in the specific case of the present

invention has to do with *critical* values input via a first separable input means controlling the *maximum* values input via second input means.

This claimed arrangement has the advantageous effect of allowing a user to set a maximum value of the compression pressure or duration depending on his/her physical condition with a high degree of safety in connection with the claimed pressure muscle training method.

Finally, it is noted that none of the other cited references overcomes the deficiencies of Jacobs outlined above.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the applied §103(a) rejections, all predicated on the deficient disclosure of Jacobs, cannot be sustained. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection are accordingly respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Dated: June 11, 2010

Respectfully submitted by:

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC
CUSTOMER NO. 92270
1901 Research Boulevard, Suite 400
Rockville, MD 20850
(301) 424-3640

/Lawrence D. Eisen/
Lawrence D. Eisen
Reg. No. 41009